

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/809,173	Applicant(s) SHERMAN, BERNARD CHARLES	
	Examiner Humera N. Sheikh	Art Unit 1615	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Humera N. Sheikh. (3) _____.

(2) Neil H. Hughes. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 07 April 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: on record (1-18).

Identification of prior art discussed: no.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

In the Advisory Action filed 3/18/04, claims 12-14 and 18 were indicated as being allowable subject matter. Attorney Hughes suggested the following: (1) To incorporate the allowable limitation of claim 12 into claim 1, reciting "greater than 80%" conversion; (2) To incorporate the allowable limitation of claim 13 into claim 12, to recite "greater than 90%" conversion; (3) To cancel claims 13 and 18. Additionally, Examiner notified Attorney that Claim 14, which was previously indicated as being allowable, could not be allowed since the claim was directed to a "composition" claim and that only the process claims could be allowed in this instance. Hence, Attorney also agreed to the cancellation of claim 14, which may be refiled separately at a future date. Examiner agreed to conduct an Examiner's Amendment making the proposed changes necessary in order to place the application in a proper condition for Allowance.